

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-8. Claims 1 and 3-6 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Claim 2 remains cancelled. Thus, claims 1 and 3-8 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,155,840 (Sallette) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,076 (Logan) and U.S. Patent No. 5,774,662 (Sakagawa).

According to Sallette, the display (400) includes an address field (410) for the presenter to submit the address on the network (104) of the source of data, where the address may be a numeric, nickname or shortened address (see, col. 7, lines 1-19). The presenter selects content by selecting from the selection list box (618) listing possible sources available to the presenter for displaying content in the first media region (612) of the presenter and audience member computer systems (see, col. 7, lines 66 through col. 8, line 7). That is, Sallette is limited to displaying content from an IP address or a location specified by a DNS name as the presenter selects the same from the selection list box.

The Examiner acknowledges that Sallette does not teach that the sequence numbers represent the output sequence, but relies on Logan as teaching the same. Logan is directed to creating scheduled programming in accordance with preferences associated with each subscriber. However, the program ID number of a particular segment in Logan simply identifies characteristic of the segment such as duration, subject matter and directs a hyperlink to an audio segment of a program (see, col. 31, lines 14-63) based on subscription information of the listener (see, Fig. 2 including corresponding text). Logan does not teach or suggest outputting content based on "sequence numbers" and "flag information" to terminal addresses as taught by the invention (see discussion of claims below).

The Examiner also acknowledges that Sakagawa does not state the address is URL information but indicates that, when combined with Sallette and Logan, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time would have modified Sakagawa's teachings of returning address information to return URL information. However, Sakagawa is directed to an ATM address table storing a corresponding relationship between a protocol address and ATM address of the terminals (see, Fig. 12 including corresponding text).

Further, a person of ordinary skill would not be motivated to modify the systems of Sallette and Logan to include the ATM address table storing a protocol address and ATM address of the terminals in Sakagawa. Thus, Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection.

The claimed invention automatically (i.e., without necessarily requiring a user to specify URL information) displays data to a user at predetermined intervals. For example, this is achieved by storing a correspondence relationship between the URL information and terminal addresses and displaying the data via the terminals determined to be notified of the URL information at predetermined intervals.

Independent claim 1, by way of example, “obtaining URL information defined on a World Wide Web information network and used by the presenter to output information on the local side computer terminal, according to a predetermined output sequence” and “transmitting pieces of obtained URL information one by one to the remote side computer terminals, and instructing an output of information by the remote side computers corresponding to the transmitted pieces of URL information as controlled by the presenter.”

The system of claim 1 stores “a correspondence relationship between pieces of URL information and a plurality of sequence numbers representing the output sequence, an address table which includes respective terminal addresses...and includes flag information indicating whether each of the terminal addresses is to be notified of the URL information.” Accordingly, the system determines a piece of URL information notified to the remote side computer terminals using the “correspondence relationship” and “causes data accessed using the URL information to be displayed at predetermined intervals via each remote side computer terminal determined to be notified of the URL information.”

Similarly, independent claims 3-6 recite, “URL information including a coordinate value indicating a position of data accessible using the URL information”, a correspondence between “the URL information and sequence numbers”, “an address table including respective terminal addresses” where “data accessed using the URL information is displayed at predetermined intervals via each remote side computer terminal determined to be notified of the URL information” (“each computer determined to be notified” in claim 6).

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of the claimed system and method including “a correspondence between the URL information and sequence numbers” according to which “data accessed using the URL

information is displayed at predetermined intervals via each remote side computer terminal determined to be notified of the URL information" (see discussion of independent claims 1 and 3-6).

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 7 recites, "said presenter controlled control unit stores bookmark data which is caused to be registered into at least one of the remote side computer terminals based on an instruction from the local side computer terminal."

The cited references do not teach or suggest causing the remote terminals to register "bookmark data... based on an instruction from the local side computer terminal", as recited in claim 7.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:**

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments were made to clarify features recited in the claims and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: Temnit Afework

Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

Date: 11/21/2006  
1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501